



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,434	06/30/2000	Il Gun Kwon	0465-0715P	9740
2292	7590	02/27/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			KE, PENG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	12

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/608,434

Applicant(s)

KWON ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6-28 and 30-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 6-28, and 30-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Detailed Action***

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 12/8/03.
2. Claims 1, 3, 6-28, and 30-52 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 18, 20, 25-28, 33, 44, 45, and 50-52 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 12/8/03, claims 2, 4, 5, and 29 are cancelled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-28, 30-41, and 43-52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fado et al. (US 5,995,933) in view of Do (US 6,417,868).

As per independent claim 1, Fado et al. teaches a method of assisting a user to make a connection between a main device and at least one peripheral device, comprising:

displaying a guide illustration on a display screen in response to a user input, the illustration showing how to connect the main device and the at least one peripheral device (Fig 21, items 262 and 264).

However, Fado et al. fails to teach the main device being a digital TV and that it is connected to at least two peripheral devices, wherein each of the two devices generates an audio signal and a video signal.

Do teaches connecting the main device, which is a digital TV with two peripheral devices, a computer and a secondary device, wherein the peripheral device generates an audio

Art Unit: 2174

signal and a video signal (col 5, lines 18-45). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Do's teaching with Fado et al.'s method in order to provide the user with an interactive guide for connecting a TV, a computer and a VCR.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 1. Fado et al. further teaches the method wherein the guide illustration shows at least one terminal plate of the Digital TV, at least one terminal plate of each of the at least two peripheral device and at least one connection between the terminal plate of the digital TV and the terminal plate of each of at least two peripheral devices (Fig 21, items 262 and 264; It is inherent when the references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices).

As per independent claim 6, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 6. Fado et al. further teaches the method wherein the illustration includes an animation to show the connection between the digital TV and the at least two peripheral devices (col 8, lines 56-65; It is inherent when the references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 6. Fado et al. further teaches wherein the illustration shows the connection between the at least two peripheral devices and the digital TV in a highlighted form (col 12, lines 61-68, col. 13, lines 1-13, col. 14, lines 13-29; It is inherent when the references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 8. Fado et al. further teaches wherein the highlighted form is a color which differs from a remainder of the illustration (col 14, lines 13-29).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 6. Fado et al. further teaches wherein the connecting portion of the digital TV is a connecting portion on an outside surface of the digital TV (Fig 21, items 262 and 264; It is inherent when the references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 6, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 6. Fado et al. further teaches wherein the displaying step displays the illustration on the display screen of the digital TV (Fig 21, items 262 and 264, col 2, lines 63-65; It is inherent when the references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 6, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 6. Fado et al. further teaches wherein the illustration shows a plurality of connecting portions of the digital TV (Fig 21, items 262 and 264, Fig 40, item 390; It is inherent when the references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 6, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 6. Fado et al. further teaches wherein the illustration shows the connecting portion of the at least two peripheral devices (Fig 21, items 262 and 264; It is inherent when the

Art Unit: 2174

references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 6, Fado et al. teaches the method of claim 6, further comprising: displaying a menu having a plurality of menu items, each menu item being associated with the at least two peripheral devices; and (Fig 5, items 124, 126, 128, 130, and 132);

receiving a user input on a selected menu item; (Fig 5, item 124); and,

wherein the displaying step displays an illustration associated with the selected menu item (Fig 21, items 262 and 264, Fig 23, item 284).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Fado et al. teaches the method of claim 14, wherein the displaying a menu step displays each menu item as an icon, each icon representing one peripheral device of the at least two peripheral devices or a combination thereof (Fig 5, item 124, Fig 21, items 262 and 264, Fig 23, item 284).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, Fado et al. teaches the method of claim 14, wherein the receiving step receives signals from an input device providing instructions on moving a cursor displayed on the display screen onto one of the menu items (Fig 5, items 124, 126, 128, 130, and 132).

As per independent claim 18, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, it is of the same scope as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per independent claim 20, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 20. Fado et al. further teaches the method comprising: adding a connection illustration to the displayed illustration in response to a second user input, the connection illustration showing a connection between the connecting portion of the at least two peripheral devices and the connecting portion of the digital TV (col 8, lines 30-55; It is inherent when the references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices). The examiner is inferring to the fact that a user can select a headset or a battery adapter, and depends on his/her selections the program would provide the user with different instructions.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 20, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 20. Fado et al. further teaches the method comprising: displaying a second illustration on the display screen in response to a second user input, the second illustration showing the connecting portion of the digital TV, the connecting portion of the at least two peripheral devices and a connection between the connecting portion of the at least two peripheral devices and the connecting portion of the Digital TV (Fig 7, item 142; It is inherent when the references are combined, the main device would be the digital TV along with at least two peripheral devices).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 20, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 20. Fado et al. further teaches the method wherein the displaying step displays each connecting portion of the digital TV (Fig 21, item 266, Fig 23, item 286).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 20, Fado et al. teaches the method of claim 20, wherein the displaying step displays each connecting portion of the digital TV and the connecting portion of more than two of the at least two peripheral devices (Fig 22, item 272).

As per independent claim 25, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per independent claim 26, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per independent claim 27, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per independent claim 28, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 28, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the apparatus of claim 28. Fado further teaches the apparatus wherein at least two peripheral devices is two of a video cassette recorder, a digital versatile disk drive, a broadcast antenna, a satellite receiver, a cable box, a disk drive, speakers, a mouse, and a printer (Fig 21, items 262 and 264). The examiner is inferring a headphone as a set of speakers.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 28, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the apparatus of claim 28. Fado further teaches the apparatus comprising:

a memory storing a plurality of guide illustrations, each guide illustration corresponding to one or a combination of the at least two peripheral devices (Fig 48, item 5).

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 28, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the apparatus of claim 28. Fado further teaches the apparatus wherein the display controller is a display controller of the digital TV (Fig 48, items 17 and 19).

As per independent claim 33, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 33, it is of the same scope as claim 7 (see rejection above).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 33, it is of the same scope as claim 8 (see rejection above).

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 35, it is of the same scope as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 33, it is of the same scope as claim 31 (see rejection above).

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 33, it is of the same scope as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 33, it is of the same scope as claim 13 (see rejection above).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 33, it is of the same scope as claim 14 (see rejection above).

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 40, it is of the same scope as claim 15 (see rejection above).

As per independent claim 44, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per independent claim 45, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 46, Fado et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the display controller adds a connection illustration to the displayed illustration in response to second user input, the connection illustration showing a connection between the connecting portion of the at least one peripheral device and the connecting portion of the main device (Fig 5, items 124, 126, 128, 130, and 132, Fig 21, items 262 and 264, Fig 23, item 284). The examiner is inferring to the fact a user can select a plurality of items from the menu and receive instructions regarding those item by pressing the next button.

As per claim 47, which is dependent on claim 46, it is of the same scope as claim 31. (see rejection above)

As per claim 48, which is dependent on claim 45, Fado et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the display controller displays a second illustration on the display screen in response to second user input, the second illustration showing the connecting portion of the digital TV, the connecting portion of the at least one peripheral device and a connection between the connecting portion of the at least one peripheral device and the connecting portion of the main device (Fig 21, items 262 and 264).

As per claim 49, which is dependent on claim 48, it is of the same scope as claim 31. (see rejection above)

As per independent claim 50, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per independent claim 51, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per independent claim 52, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

Claims 16, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fado et al. (US 5,995,933) in view of Do (US 6,417,868) further in view of Choi (US 5,828,834).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, Fado et al. in view of Do teach the method of claim 14. However, Fado et al and Do fail to teach the method, wherein the receiving step receives a signal from an input device indicating that a key of the input device associated with one of the menu items has been operated by the user. Choi teaches a method which required the user to enter an ID from the input device to access the device (col 5, lines 37-68). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Choi's teaching with the method of Fado et al. and Do in order to prevent unauthorized user from using the device.

As per claim 42, which is dependent on claim 40, it is of the same scope as claim 16. (see rejection above).

As per claim 43, which is dependent on claim 40, it is of the same scope as claim 16 (see rejection above).

***Response to Argument***

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/8/03, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument includes the following:

A) Do doesn't teach or suggest a digital TV.

B) He fails to teach connecting the digital TV to two or more devices.

Examiner disagrees.

A) Do teaches connecting the TV to a computer without a A to D or D or A converter (col. 5, lines 13-32). Therefore, the TV can't be an analog TV, and the examiner interprets the TV to be a digital TV.

B) Do teaches connecting the TV to a computer (col. 5, lines 13-32), and connecting the TV to an another secondary device, such as Camera, camcorder, or VCR (col. 5, lines 32-45)

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (703) 305-7615. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100